

Serial No. 10/748,671

The indication that claims 4 and 5 contain allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. Applicants respectfully submit, however, for the reasons given below that all examined claims are allowable.

The rejection of claims 1 to 3 and 10 under 35 USC 102 as allegedly anticipated by Ogino et al. '518 is respectfully traversed.

The multi-screen projector system of the reference does not teach or suggest the Fresnel lens sheet or a rear projection screen containing recited same in applicants' claims.

The independent claim (claim 1) specifies, among other things, that each root is curved toward the another prism side from the one prism side. A representative embodiment is shown in Fig. 2; see the related discussion on pages 12 and 13 of the specification. Applicants' claimed arrangement allows light obliquely pointed to a Fresnel lens sheet to emerge therefrom as nearly parallel rays. A double image problem is avoided.

Ogino et al. '518 discloses a multi-screen projector including unit module projectors (1, 2, 3, and 4), and unit module screens (5, 6, 7, and 8) in which each of the unit module screens comprises

Serial No. 10/748,671

a Fresnel lens sheet (9), a lenticular sheet (10), and a prism sheet (11); see Figs. 2A and 3 of the reference.

Those Fresnel lens sheets (9) for each of the module screens 5 to 8 is but an ordinary Fresnel lens and includes no planes of total reflection, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action. Should the rejection be maintained, the Examiner is asked to explain on the record where Igino et al. '518 shows a plane of total reflection. The cited portion of the reference (column 3, lines 24 to 64) does not teach or suggest the stated features of instant claim 1.

Moreover, although the prism sheet (11) includes a plurality of prisms (12) (see Fig. 4 of the reference), those prisms include no planes of total reflection, again contrary to the assertion in the Office Action. Fig. 3 of the reference clearly shows that the light entering the prism sheet (11) simply refracts twice at the entrance surface and the exit surface thereof, meaning that a total reflection of the light never occurs in prism sheet (11). Thus the prisms of the prism sheet of Ogino et al. '518 include only planes of refraction and include no planes of total reflection. Lastly, the Examiner should note that the prisms in the reference are

Serial No. 10/748,671

formed on the prism sheet and not on the Fresnel lens even, though the Office Action contains an assertion that the plurality of prisms are formed on the base sheet; Fig. 4 of the reference does not so show.

Ogino et al. '518 therefore inherently does not disclose a total reflection type of Fresnel lens as claimed herein, which includes both the plane of refraction and the plane of total reflection. The claims patentably define over the reference and a USPTO paper to those ends is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.



Charles A. Wendel  
Registration No. 24,453

Date

CAW/ch

Attorney Docket No.: DAIN:761

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.  
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805  
Telephone: (703) 739-0220

PLEASE ACCEPT THIS AS  
AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT  
OR CREDIT FEES TO  
DEP. ACCT. 16-0331  
PARKHURST & WENDEL